

When the name of Lee is mentioned to the unprejudiced, at once he is associated with the great generals of all time. We link him with Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Jackson, and a few others. Born the son of a distinguished Revolutionary soldier, his scholarly attainments at West Point made his recall there as superintendent a natural sequence. While he at first opposed secession with such means available to him as an Army officer and was offered the supreme field command of the United States Army, he, nevertheless, through loyalty and devotion to his native Virginia resigned his commission and became the leader of all the southern forces. His ability and leadership was demonstrated under General Scott in the War with Mexico. While he may have resisted to the bitter end, his regard for the welfare of his men, his beloved Southland and her future caused him to tender his sword to Grant at Appomattox on April 9, 1865. His greatness, his humility, and his reverence for the things eternal are reflected in his final order to his troops which he issued on the following day of April 10, 1865. His words in that order were:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF
NORTHERN VIRGINIA,
April 10, 1865.

After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them; but, feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest, I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. By the terms of the agreement, officers and men can return to their homes and remain there until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection. With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

R. E. LEE, General.

The eloquent tribute to the bravery and devotion of his men were expressed in Lee's last order to his troops. His affection for them and consideration for their future led to the cessation of hostilities.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Fredericksburg, Va., having been educated at the United States Naval Academy, became an officer in the United States Navy. Historians say he was trained to the sea. After a few years, due to an accident, he retired but continued his devotion to naval affairs as a civilian. His worldwide fame was achieved at a conference in Brussels in 1855. This resulted in his restoration to active naval service as a commander. He had distinguished himself as head of the United States Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office. His authorship of the Physical Geography of the Sea, Wind and Currents Charts, and other meteorological works resulted in the renown for him in his day as the world's most distinguished oceanographer and hydrographer. When the War Between the States began, he resigned his command in the Navy of the United States and assumed the harbor defenses of the meager southern navy. Upon the close of the war, he retired to Lexington as the professor of meteorology at the Virginia Military Institute. By training, study, and excellence in naval affairs we are happy to acclaim him as one of the leading naval authorities of our country and particularly of the Southland.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, one of the most daring and successful military tacticians ever to wear a soldier's uniform was much younger than either Lee or Maury. From Clarksburg, then a part of Virginia, he entered and graduated from West Point. He gave evidence early in life of his military genius. His army career with the United States was of rather short duration, for we find him as military instructor at Virginia Military Institute when hostilities began. He became a colonel in the Virginia Militia and soon rose to the rank of brigadier and major general. His achievements, his courage, and valor have become the topics of discussion among military men of all succeeding generations. His surprise attacks and sudden exploits in the Shenandoah Valley confounded and surprised the Union forces to the extent that Jackson soon had the reputation of being the ablest of Lee's generals. While a strict disciplinarian, he was an ardent Calvinist and a devout Christian. His troops loved him for his genius, his abilities, and his personal worth. General Lee once said that had he had the services of Jackson at Gettysburg, the outcome there would have been different.

To praise these men is not to minimize others; nor does that praise detract from the respect and admiration, for the rank and file of our men and women; yea the debt, we shall never be able to pay.

Defeats and sorrows give us a better nature. They add to our resourcefulness. In

crises we surprise ourselves with what can be accomplished. I am indebted to the great minister who conducts the national pulpit of the air on Sunday mornings for the thought that in despair and reverses that Dante wrote his masterpiece. John Milton wrote his greatest work when blindness had fallen upon him. Tennyson, in struggle for light during his sorrow over the death of a friend, gave us his great In Memoriam. Continuing, Doctor Sockman said:

"Dr. Edwin Mims, of Vanderbilt University, once declared that Robert E. Lee did more for the South in the 5 years after his surrender at Appomattox than during the 5 years he was so brilliantly leading his troops. He took the leadership of a college in Virginia and with no rancor of spirit, he manifested a magnanimity and nobility which made him revered in the South and respected throughout the whole Nation."

While we could spend hours rehearsing the lives and deeds of any one of the three whom we honor tonight, vain would be our proceedings unless from "Defeat we receive its dividends." Surely the morale of the human race has been lifted more by those who have courageously borne their defeats than those whom success have ever attended. The inspiration of these lives to our fathers and mothers are ours to transmit to our children and they to theirs. In complete succession we shall ever keep fresh in the minds and hearts of our people the measure of gratitude to these illustrious men of our past. Back of me on the wall of my office is an almost life-size picture of Robert E. Lee. As I gaze upon it, my spirit from day to day is refreshed by thought and hope that in defeat, sorrow, and surrender comes crowning achievements if we will but persist in the right. So my friends, it is well that you have dedicated yourselves to carrying on in the paths your parents treaded. Surely, the joy, the happiness and blessings which are ours shall then increase for all. The faith of our fathers and mothers must remain with us as a constant reminder. In that faith, sustained by the influence of the Supreme Being are born the virtues of our existence exalted in the lines:

"God in all His glory rules

Watching over us with care

He sends us wisdom, love and truth

With his fellowman to share."

To Lee, Maury, and Jackson, representative as they are of all that is noble in a cause dear to their hearts, we of the South must never cease to acknowledge our debt of gratitude and appreciation. Their names as symbols of many others must ever be spoken of in reverence. To remember them is both an opportunity and a pleasure. To you and me it shall ever be a sacred duty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee. Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world, with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and bowing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own

wills and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we come to Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered here may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion and from the treason of inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the part of the House, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. COLE, of New York; Mr. HINSHAW, of California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 66)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to Federal personnel legislation, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we have heard the President's message, recommending the enactment of legislation which would further improve the position of Government career employees. This message includes recommendations for increased pay, adjustments in pay scales, group health insurance, employee training, personnel practices affecting Government employees stationed overseas, and increased travel allowances.

It is my sincere hope that we may obtain early consideration of this proposed legislation, and favorable action on the part of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In my opinion, the Federal employees merit these proposed recommendations.

Last evening I was presented a citation by the Federal Club for outstanding service to the career employees of the Federal Government. The membership of the Federal Club is composed of men in responsible career positions in the Federal Government. This was a great honor, and was greatly appreciated by me.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the citation.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In recognition of outstanding services rendered to the common weal in civic, State, and Federal activities, in his professional and legislative career, and for his vigorous advocacy of the improvement of the quality and public recognition of the integrity of the career service, and for fostering of the welfare of Federal civilian personnel, the Federal Club, Inc., hereby confers its honor award citation on the Honorable FRANK CARLSON.

In testimony whereof there is affixed the seal of the Federal Club, Inc., and the signature of the president, the secretary, and the chairman of the awards committee this 13th day of December 1954.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the speech I made on receiving the award, and I ask that it be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my good friends and members of the Federal Club. I shall long remember the gracious remarks which accompanied the presentation of this wonderful award by the Federal Club. When I think of the distinguished public figures who have received this annual award from your fine organization, I realize your great kindness to me. I shall cherish this honor and I will keep faith with you.

At the outset, I wish to commend the Federal Club for its many contributions to our Government service. Your members have been responsible for developing ideas which have helped maintain our Federal service in the respected place it occupies among the governments of the world. Over the years you have been complimented by chief executives of the Nation and other high public officials. I wish to add my commendation to the many richly deserved compliments you have already received.

For over a quarter of a century I have served the people of my State in the House of Representatives, as Governor of Kansas, and as a Member of the United States Senate. In all of this public service I have firmly believed in a merit civil-service system for public employees.

In the capacity of chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the past 2 years I worked for the improvement of the Federal civil service. I will continue to work toward securing fair and just benefits for Federal employees in the future as I have in the past.

Under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the past 2 years have been great milestones on the road of civil service progress.

Federal employees have secured benefits and privileges which they have strived for years to obtain.

Upon recommendation of the President the Congress last year approved low-cost life insurance and unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

I introduced legislation which became known as the fringe benefits bill. Following the hearings when our committee considered the views of Federal employees organizations and the endorsements of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, this bill was approved and became law. In my opinion, it is one of the most progressive laws to improve the civil-service system which has been enacted in recent years.

Among the important provisions contained in this law are: a more realistic overtime pay structure; authority to pay above the minimum rates in grades where competition with private industry requires additional compensation to attract well-qualified Federal employees; the repeal of the restrictive provisions of the so-called Whitten amendment which have interfered with necessary civil-service reforms; a uniform allowance for Federal employees who are required to wear uniforms in connection with their official duties; and a more effective incentive awards program for Federal employees under which initiative and contributions to the public service by Federal employees are recognized through higher monetary awards to individual employees.

For retired Federal employees the last Congress provided for making permanent temporary annuity increases and under the tax law which was approved—retired Federal employees are granted a generous exemption. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, it was a pleasure to assist in writing and securing approval of this legislation.

I was the author of the pay-increase bill for Federal and postal employees which was approved by the Congress but vetoed by the President. I believed that bill was fair to all Federal employees and it is my earnest hope that at an early date the Congress will pass similar legislation which will be approved by the President.

Tomorrow, January 11, President Eisenhower will send a special message to the Congress outlining his views with respect to a proposed salary adjustment for Federal and postal employees. From what I have learned, this proposal will not differ materially from my bill which was approved by the Congress last summer.

Federal employees deserve a salary adjustment because for many positions the salaries

paid Federal employees are substantially less than those paid for similar work in private industry. While I recognize that Government salaries in top-level positions will never be comparable to salaries paid persons in private industry for similar work, yet I think the Government owes an obligation to all of the people of the United States to make certain that its employees are treated as fairly as possible within a reasonable budget.

In my opinion, the cost of such a pay adjustment and the cost of other fringe benefits which were approved during the last Congress are necessary and vital operating costs of conducting the business of the finest Government in the world.

I look upon these expenditures as an investment, an investment in the future of America. Those who devote their working years to public service are entitled to at least two things: First, reasonable security with an expectation of adequate retirement benefits; and, second, adequate compensation for the work performed as well as entitlement to those fringe benefits now enjoyed by most workers in private industry. Federal employees demand no more and the people of our Nation expect no less for those persons who conduct the day-by-day affairs of our Government.

During my service in Congress I have had an opportunity to know and cherish the friendship of many hundreds of Federal employees. From the many things they have told me about their problems, I know that there is more to their work than is generally realized by the public outside our Nation's Capital.

First, I know the zeal and integrity with which they approach their daily work; I know that the overwhelming majority are loyal to our country. The vast majority are not concerned with politics and they readily adapt themselves to whatever changes in Government the American people decide.

It is these thousands upon thousands of Federal employees who are responsible for the continuity of Government operations through good years and bad years, war and peace, depression and prosperity.

It is for these reasons that I cannot consider Federal employees in terms of statistics, personnel actions, 201 files or pieces of paper.

We have made great progress in many fields relating to personnel administration which has produced a better civil-service system. But there remains yet a vast unexplored field which relates to the important functions of proper placement, improved training programs, management-employee relations, executive development, recruiting methods, promotion policies, and a host of other factors which daily affect the lives and futures of Federal employees and their families.

It is in this relatively unexplored and uncharted sea that remains in the future's challenge to all of us to make greater progress and to obtain improvements.

This is why I feel that we must devote our energies and attention to the improvement of the individual dignity of each Federal employee, and make certain each employee understands the role he plays in the important activities of Government. It will be from this new sense of pride in a job well done and the fact that each employee will understand the part he plays in making our Government strong, that the true measure of Federal employee morale will be determined in the future.

In spite of the outstanding record of the last Congress toward improving the civil-service system and providing liberal benefits for Federal employees, there are those who contend that Federal employee morale has suffered during the past 2 years. Nothing could be further from the truth. The recent election did not demonstrate that Federal employees are dissatisfied with the record of the Congress or of the administration. As a matter of fact, I believe the rank

and file of Federal employees consider themselves as having received as fair treatment during the past 2 years as at any other time in history. I believe, too, that these charges of lowered employee morale are based on political considerations. They have no substance.

In my opinion, the President will submit legislative proposals to the Congress within a short time to raise further the standard of the Federal service and to provide additional benefits for Federal employees. In addition to the pay adjustments which will be requested tomorrow, I believe the President will submit proposals strengthening the new life-insurance program and providing health insurance for Federal employees. From time to time during the session additional legislative proposals will be submitted to Congress strengthening the civil-service system generally which will react to the benefit of all Federal employees.

During the past few months there has been considerable discussion in regard to the dismissal of Federal employees for security reasons and rumors are current that the new Congress, under new leadership, will initiate an investigation of the entire security program.

Permit me to observe that I do not oppose any honest inquiry or study which will be productive or result in a better civil-service system.

I know that nothing has been done during the past 2 years in the executive branch that requires concealment from the public.

President Eisenhower is surrounded by an excellent group of able and conscientious public officials. They have been fair and honest with the people of the United States. I would consider it shameful if the present congressional leadership would seek to initiate any kind of investigation which would tend to destroy the progress which has been made or will use their present authority for partisan political demagoguery.

I am and have always been a strong supporter of the true merit system, but I desire to differentiate between that and the equally illustrious group of those in policymaking positions. I have always felt that to aid the administration in power all of this latter group should be selected carefully by the administration so that the philosophy of that administration would be implemented throughout the entire Government.

I believe everyone must agree that the administration in power is entitled to and must have men and women in key positions whose thinking is attuned to that of those in authority.

We cannot afford the luxury of indulging in political fights of this nature while larger issues involving the maintenance of a sound domestic economy, military preparedness, and a firm foreign policy are of paramount importance.

This month we begin a new year. Most of us here are engaged in the great work of making our Government stronger to resist the dangers inherent in an atheistic philosophy which seeks to engulf and destroy the free nations of the world.

I have thought of what ideals and principles should motivate us during the coming year. I can think of no better description of our point of view than to recall for you a poem written by Walter Reed Hunt, a famous New England church official in the 19th century whose ideas are as appropriate today as they were during his lifetime:

"A MORNING WISH"

"The sun is just rising on the morning of another day, the first day of a new year. What can I wish that this day, this year, may bring to me? Nothing that shall make the world or others poorer, nothing at the expense of other men; but just those few things which in their coming do not stop with me,

but touch me rather, as they pass and gather strength:

"A few friends who understand me, and yet remain my friends.

"A work to do which has real value without which the world would feel the poorer.

"A return for such work small enough not to tax unduly any one who pays.

"A mind unafraid to travel, even though the trail be not blazed.

"An understanding heart.

"A sight of the eternal hills and unresting sea, and of something beautiful the hand of man has made.

"A sense of humor and the power to laugh.

"A little leisure with nothing to do.

"A few moments of quiet, silent meditation. The sense of the presence of God.

"And the patience to wait for the coming of these things, with the wisdom to know them when they come."

LEGISLATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 65)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to legislation for postal employees, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

FORMER SENATOR GUY M. GILLETTE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, very recently the Young Democratic Club of the State University of Iowa adopted a resolution commending former Senator Guy M. Gillette for his service to the State of Iowa. It gives me considerable pleasure, having served with Senator Gillette for many years, to read this resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of that organization:

Whereas Guy M. Gillette has very ably served the State of Iowa for 16 years in the United States Senate and has been a leader in Congress,

We, the State University of Iowa Young Democrats, extend to Senator Gillette our thanks and appreciation for this faithful service.

DEVELOPMENT OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN CUTOFF—RESOLUTION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Burlington, Vt., relating to the Lake Champlain cutoff.

I hope very much that the administration will make the necessary investigations as to the cost and usefulness of the proposed cutoff.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to Lake Champlain cutoff

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Burlington, as follows:

Whereas in the past this board has repeatedly expressed its wholehearted support of proposed legislation in the Congress for the development of the Lake Champlain Cutoff in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway project; and

Whereas it is increasingly apparent that the prosperity of this area is becoming more and more dependent upon the enactment of such legislation; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board hereby requests the active support of such proposed legislation by the members of the Vermont delegation in the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk forward to the members of such delegation a certified copy of this resolution.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON PRODUCTION OF DURUM WHEAT—LETTER FROM WARD COUNTY (N. DAK.) CROP IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter dated December 30, 1954, from the Crop Improvement Association, Ward County Courthouse, Minot, N. Dak., signed by its president, Joe Parizek, dealing with the matter of an increase in acreage in durum wheat and also with the subject of crop insurance.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARD COUNTY CROP
IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Minot, N. Dak., December 30, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The Ward County Crop Improvement Association unanimously adopted the following resolution at a meeting held November 29, 1954:

"Whereas the production of amber durum wheat in the United States during the past 2 years has been approximately one-third of the amount normally consumed; and

"Whereas the available varieties of amber durum wheat are more susceptible to stem rust than hard wheat, the risk involved in raising durum is much greater than for hard wheat; and

"Whereas the cost of amber durum seed is nearly twice that for hard wheat of comparable quality and difficult to secure; and

"Whereas crop insurance is not now available to growers of amber durum in much of the durum producing area of North Dakota, farmers will seed hard wheat instead of durum on their allotted wheat acres, thus the potential supply of amber durum will be further reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Ward County Crop Improvement Association, That the Secretary of Agriculture and the United States Congress be requested to remove all acreage restrictions for seeding amber durum wheat in 1955 to provide an incentive for increasing production of this wheat of which there is a critical shortage."

Sincerely,

JOE PARIZEK,
President.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 301. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 302. A bill amending section 500 of The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 303. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 304. A bill authorizing the construction of a highway bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal at Summit, Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Francesco Sebastiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 306. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Eva Elisabeth Uber English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 308. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 310. A bill to require that automobiles introduced into, delivered for introduction into, or operated in, interstate commerce be equipped with safety belts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 311. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 312. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 313. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses

committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Stanley William Wheatland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Asher Ezra-chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 316. A bill to extend the period within which farmers may file petitions for relief under section 75 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 317. A bill to supersede certain provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 with respect to the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Chih Shing Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 319. A bill for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr.;

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Anni Margatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David, nee Gebrael; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando;

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen;

S. 325. A bill for the relief of Elvira Tocchio Anzedei;

S. 326. A bill for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofblad;

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Joao-Pinguel Rodrigues;

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chih Sugiura, Motoko Sugiura, Atsushi Sugiura, and Kumi Sugiura; and

S. 329. A bill for the relief of Jean Jing Peo Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 330. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of the city of Baltimore, Md.;

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak;

S. 333. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Union Iron Works; and

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tanash H. Atoynatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 335. A bill to provide for a heliport in the District of Columbia for use in helicopter service between the Friendship International Airport and the downtown area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 336. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 337. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill for Mr. SMATHERS, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to assure the equal application of the Constitution and laws of the United States to individuals of both sexes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by me last year in connection with a similar bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 301) to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS

This bill would help to preserve that great portion of the true history of our Nation which is recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and in currently published weekly papers of the United States.

There are many public and private agencies which have preserved the files or the microfilms of our great daily newspapers. They are an excellent primary source of recorded history. However, the full and complete story of our Nation's history and progress cannot be preserved unless we save that which is recorded in the weekly newspapers published throughout the land.

During the early years of our Nation's history we had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, social, political, and religious history of a great portion of our population can be found only in the files of these weekly publications. As a boy I learned to appreciate this fact. My father published weekly newspapers in four different towns of Texas. He left the publishing business in later years, but always retained

and carefully preserved the bound volumes of all issues of his newspapers. First I knew them as carefully guarded family treasures, but later I found that they were a constant source of the history of the communities in which they were published. They are now preserved in the library of one of our leading universities.

There are thousands of weekly newspaper files which have been preserved. Others have been destroyed, and in the future there is likely to be continued loss of this valuable historical material unless something is done to encourage its preservation.

Mr. Garland R. Farmer, owner and publisher of the *Henderson Times* at Henderson, Tex., a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, saw the need for a national library of weekly newspapers several years ago. With private funds and at his own expense he established such a library and began a nationwide campaign for preservation of weekly newspaper files. His work has inspired me to offer this legislation.

The following is an article written by Mr. Farmer:

"WHY WE NEED THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS"

"For many years this Nation had only weekly newspapers. Even today, the educational, political, social, and religious history of the major part of our people can be found only in the files of these publications.

"As a weekly newspaperman for over 25 years, I learned that little or nothing was being done to preserve this rich store of information, and make it available to all, even though much was being lost every day.

"So I called this neglect to the attention of the Library of Congress, American foundations, historical and press associations, colleges, libraries, and the general public.

"The response was immediate and almost unanimous. They agreed the idea of a National Library of Weekly Newspapers was excellent—should have been started generations ago—but where to get the funds to 'get the show on the road?'

"Not satisfied to allow the campaign to bog down, I started using my own personal funds to set up the National Library of Weekly Newspapers here in Henderson. About 96 percent of the services and contacts are by mail, so location of the library is not important.

"Too, it is one of the primary functions of this library to work with and through press and historical associations; State, college, and local libraries to encourage and assist the 48 States in setting up their own programs to preserve this vital store of historical information. The job is too big for one organization, but one organization is needed for the overall work.

"With the financial aid of a few other firms and individuals, I have this program on a national and nonprofit basis, but the problem is one that involves everyone—even you. The burden should not be borne by one or just a few.

"So, I am offering to turn all my accumulated data, microfilmed weeklies, cabinets, files, etc., to the Federal Government, if only a staff of three is provided to carry on the work.

"My program has been strongly endorsed by such colleges as: Stanford, Florida State, University of Texas, Columbia, Michigan, Iowa, Missouri, and so on across the Nation.

"Students, teachers, and historians say the work has already been neglected too long. Leaders of both major political parties, in and out of Congress, say they are ready to act, and asked me to draw up a bill which could help at a minimum cost.

"That makes good sense, for there are over 8,000 weekly newspapers in the United States, and their readers elect 75 percent of the United States Senators and 61 percent of our Representatives.

"This letter, with enclosures, should give you a fair picture of the need, which has been neglected too long.

"Cordially,

"GARLAND R. FARMER,
"Henderson (Tex.) Times."

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S RE-ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

The bill (S. 302) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced will extend the life of the GI loan program which first was authorized by the Congress in title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It is my hope that this bill will receive the wholehearted support it so richly deserves. If the GI loan program is not continued millions of our World War II veterans will fail to share in this benefit.

Under the GI loan program of the Veterans' Administration the generous terms of GI financing are made available by private banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, and other investors, since the partial guaranty of VA encourages the lenders to make loans at moderate interest rates and on very liberal credit terms. Most GI loans are made with no downpayment, or with a much smaller cash downpayment requirement than is normally required by a lender, and a maximum maturity of 30 years is permissible.

The Veterans' Administration has underwritten nearly 3,900,000 loans made to veterans by these private lending institutions. More than 3,600,000 were made for the purchase or construction of homes, 218,000 were business loans and another 67,000 were made in connection with farming activity. The dollar volume of closed loans is in excess of \$26½ billion with the VA guaranty or insurance in excess of \$14 billion. More than 760,000 of these loans have been paid in full, and it is estimated that the outstanding loan balances total about \$19.3 billion on which the Government's contingent liability amounts to approximately \$10.6 billion.

The repayment record which our veterans have maintained is little short of astounding. The VA has been called upon to pay a total of 34,000 claims, which represents less than 1 percent of all loans closed. In the case of home loans the VA has been called upon to pay claims on about one-half of 1 percent of the cases. This fine record is a tribute not only to the individual vet-

erans, but also demonstrates the care with which the loans were made by the private lending institutions and the diligent manner in which they were serviced.

And now let us consider how expensive this program has been to the Government. The largest single cost item to the Government to date has been the gratuity payment which was in an amount equal to 4 percent of the guaranteed or insured portion of the loans. The gratuity was limited to \$160 for each veteran and the payments totaled slightly more than \$400 million. However, this gratuity has not been paid on any loans approved after September 1, 1953. A total of about \$125 million has been expended in connection with claims and the purchase of properties incident to the salvage operation. Of this amount about \$61.5 million represents claim payments and the balance was disbursed in acquiring properties, purchasing loans where foreclosure was imminent and other property management and sales expenses involved in liquidation. Of the \$125 million gross expenditure, more than \$41.5 million has been returned to the Treasury from property sales and rentals, from recoveries on claim payments, and from principal and interest payments on properties sold on credit terms and acquired loans. In addition, there are assets on hand, comprised of the balances due from properties sold on terms and acquired loans, totaling about \$53 million, and unsold properties on hand valued at about \$12 million. Thus the assets together with the funds already returned to the Treasury total \$106.5 million, and in addition there is \$23.5 million due from veterans and others as a result of the guaranty payments. When we consider that more than 3½ million veterans have gotten started down the road toward debt-free home ownership, or helped in their business or farm endeavors, the price truly has been small. There is nothing which will contribute more to the preservation of our American way of life than making it possible for people to own their own homes or to assist energetic young people in getting started in a farm or business operation. The whole Nation has gained by reason of the increased stability and civic responsibility which necessarily follows from the establishment of vast numbers of veterans' families in their own homes, which never could have been attained without the benefits of the preferential financing terms of the GI loan.

The GI loan program for World War II veterans will terminate on July 25, 1957. Veterans of the Korean conflict will have 10 years from the recently established January 31, 1955, cutoff date, and my bill will have no application to them. However, there still are about 11 million eligible veterans with World War II service only who have not made any use of their GI loan benefit, and most of those who have made use of their entitlement have a substantial amount remaining which may be used for the purchase, construction, or repair of residential property. It has been estimated that between one and three million more veterans of World War II will

not be able to take advantage of their GI loan rights if we allow this law to expire on July 25, 1957. This would mean that between eight and ten million World War II veterans would not, for one reason or another, have been able to obtain the benefit Congress intended for them. Many have held off buying in the belief that there would be a general leveling off so that they could better project their future plans. Others found that there was a general unavailability of mortgage money when they endeavored to obtain their loans.

Furthermore, when the original 10-year limitation was imposed we had no way of foretelling that there would be an additional disruption in our economy made necessary by the action we were forced to take in Korea. This had the natural consequence of upsetting the timetable of many World War II veterans even though they were not called upon to return to active duty. In addition, for a period of nearly 3 years credit controls were imposed which required that cash payments of substantial amounts be made in some cases and that the maximum maturities be shortened. In all fairness to these veterans they should be afforded a further opportunity to take advantage of their GI loan benefits in order to compensate for the general upheaval caused in our economy by the Korean conflict.

We also should consider carefully the industrial impact which the GI loan program has had and the consequences which would result from its discontinuance. All of us are aware of the large part played by the construction industry in maintaining high economic levels during the past several years. During the past year it is estimated that nearly 25 percent of all homes completed were financed with GI loans. About 17,000 builders are engaged in the construction of homes which are sold to veterans with the assistance of GI loans. Since the beginning of the program it is estimated that about \$17 billion was paid by veterans in connection with the purchase of new residences. In turn, this sum can be translated into proportionate amounts paid to construction workers, to the producers and sellers of building materials, and then returned to the economic stream. When viewed in this light it will be seen that in producing \$17 billion worth of veterans' homes a large lift is given to a broad segment of our national economy.

Since the current law will not expire until July 25, 1957, the question naturally occurs of why we should consider an extension in this session. I alluded earlier to the estimated number of World War II veterans who were likely to use their benefit before the present law expires. Whether this figure is 1 million or 3 million there are bound to be undesirable consequences, and the larger the number the more magnified will be the problem. I have reference to the natural rush which will occur to get in under the wire. It very well could result in considerable panic buying, and the competition which will occur in the bidding for the existing housing supply may have dire results. There truly could develop a boom-and-bust propo-

sition, with greatly accelerated activity during the next 2½ years followed by a sharp breakdown in the latter part of 1957. I fear that this would have a much too disruptive effect, and, in fact, might be a disservice rather than a benefit to the veterans involved.

Furthermore, the financing plans of investors and the planning of projects by builders ordinarily are projected over a considerable period of time. It therefore becomes necessary for both the lenders and builders to know what lies ahead in the field of Government-aided financing so that they may take it into account in determining future outlook. This is much too important a program, both to the veterans and to the industry groups, to leave the Government's role in the field of uncertainty. The Government's position must be clarified promptly in order to avoid any possibility of allowing a slowdown to occur which will result in consequences that it will take many months to repair.

I am proud to be identified as the sponsor of this bill which will do so much by way of assisting a great many veterans and which as an agreeable by-product will furnish a substantial bolstering ingredient to our economy. I urge that this bill be favorably considered in this session of Congress.

STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM WITH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES—EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I ask unanimous consent that the explanatory statements on the bills, prepared by the junior Senator from Florida, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. SMATHERS) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:
S. 338. A bill to establish an effective student exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

The proposed bill would provide for a more extensive student exchange program on a reciprocal basis with Latin American countries. It would authorize the Secretary of State to conduct this program on a graduate student and an undergraduate student basis where the undergraduate student has completed at least 2 years of education above the secondary level.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to provide for interchanges between the United States and Latin American countries of books, periodicals and publications and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

To assist the Secretary of State in the conduct of a broader student exchange program, my bill contains a provision which sets up a Latin American Scholarship Board consisting of 10 members to be appointed by the President. This Board would make a selection of American students accepted for study in various Latin American countries, as well as to make recommendations to the Secretary of State concerning the operation and administration of the exchange program.

The proposed legislation would also authorize the Secretary of State to cooperate with the heads of the various Departments and agencies of the Government for the purpose of utilizing the services and facilities of such Departments and agencies whenever practicable in connection with carrying out the program. In line with this provision he is also authorized to consult the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board with a view toward utilizing surface and air transportation facilities which are recipients of subsidies from the United States in connection with the transportation of students.

There is much need for this proposed legislation for the reason that the present student-exchange program now in operation is limited only to graduate students and professional leaders and is wholly inadequate. For example, in the fiscal year of 1954 there were only 73 students from Latin America in the United States. For the fiscal year of 1955 this number was increased to 132. These figures amply demonstrate the meager Latin-American student-exchange program now in effect and the extreme necessity that Congress take prompt action to correct the situation to promote better hemispheric mutual understanding since we all recognize that Latin America is of vital importance to us and we of equal importance to that area.

To carry out the purposes of this bill, there is a provision which would authorize an appropriation of \$5 million for the first fiscal year after its enactment and such sums as may be deemed necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Latin America today is beset with gigantic economic problems which must be met and solved if this hemisphere is to remain secure. We must help solve their problems or else be prepared to suffer the consequences. The proposed student-exchange program is one way in which we can make a very substantial contribution in this respect for there is no doubt in my mind that it will pay off in years and in generations to come by developing closer ties of friendship and culture, as well as resulting in mutual economic advantages to each other. It is the soundest long-term investment that the United States can conceivably make, and at the same time demonstrate by positive action that we are sincerely interested in giving more than lip-service to the term "good neighbor." In addition, the adoption by the Congress of this broader student-exchange program would give renewed faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy in this hemisphere and the world.

I sincerely hope that prompt and effective action on this legislation will be taken in this session of the Congress.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 339. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The statement by Senator SMATHERS, presented by Mr. CLEMENTS, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

In introducing the proposed legislation at this time, it is my hope that adequate opportunity will be had by the committee to report it out favorably in time to permit action to be taken on it when the next tax legislation is referred by the House to the Senate for consideration.

Briefly stated, the purpose of my bill is to remove the unjust and discriminatory provisions of existing law against travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada, since these are the only areas of foreign travel subject to tax. The bill would simply treat all foreign travel equally.

The original transportation-tax law, enacted in 1941, was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage civilian travel at a time when the railroads, airlines and other forms of public transportation were vitally needed for troop movements and other essential travel.

In 1947, the law was amended by exempting from its provisions the tax on all foreign travel except travel within the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere which was defined as an area lying west of the 30th meridian west of Greenwich, east of the international dateline and north of the Equator, but not including any country of South America. Its objective was to encourage travel to Europe and South America in order to bring United States dollars to those countries for the purpose of offsetting unfavorable balances of trade as well as to assist Europe to recover from the ravages of World War II. (At that time the tax was at the rate of 15 percent. It was subsequently reduced to 10 percent by the passage of the Excise Tax Act of 1954.) While the amendment in my opinion produced the beneficial results sought to be accomplished, it created an inequitable situation by making the tax on foreign travel only applicable to travel to the Caribbean, Central America, Mexico, and Canada. It is in this respect that the present law is discriminatory against our nearby Latin American neighbors to the south, as well as to Canada, our good neighbor to the north. That these countries should be singled out in this manner is manifestly unjust particularly in view of the fact that we are vitally interested in further developing a sound and effective good-neighbor policy. I might point out here that both Canada and Mexico have long since repealed their travel tax embracing practically the same area to which our tax is now for the most part applicable.

Tourism and transit trade are important segments in the economies of our Latin American neighbors for it is in these activities that United States dollars are obtained which aid in offsetting unfavorable balances of trade that presently exist. The Caribbean area, for example, imports heavily and represents a large nearby market for our exports. The repeal of the transportation tax would undoubtedly increase the flow of American dollars to this area and the purchasing power thus provided would result in a net benefit to our own national economy.

Latin America today is beset, among other things, with economic difficulties and in view of our dependency upon each other we must assist this area in the solution of its problems or suffer from the consequences. We can take a step in the right direction by repealing the discriminatory transportation tax which represents a chief impediment toward the flow of dollars to these areas.

My bill simply provides that only the domestic portion of international travel purchased in the United States is taxable, thus removing the discriminatory provisions of existing law and putting all international travel on the same basis. In other words, that part of the trip from the point of origin in the United States to the last point in the United States at which the carrier makes a stop enroute to their foreign destination is subject to the tax. If the carrier makes no intermediate stop in the United States, no tax would apply. No other change is made in existing law. The proposed legislation retains the exemption now provided for steamship travel when the vessel does not make full traffic stops in the United States.

In the last Congress I introduced similar legislation but unfortunately it was not acted upon, despite the fact that favorable views were given by the interested executive departments of the Government. In submitting its views on that legislation the Department of State in a letter dated July 20, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, stated as follows:

"Reference is made to your letter of April 5, 1954, requesting the comments of the Department of State on S. 1353, 'To amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies,' and the Department's acknowledgment of April 6, 1954.

"The Department favors repeal of the tax on travel to the countries affected, on the grounds that it discriminates between them and other foreign countries and thereby tends to reduce the potential volume of tourist movement to the areas covered by the tax.

"Because of the discriminatory nature of this tax, it continues to be a source of irritation in our foreign relations with the countries in the area. The tourist trade is a major economic activity there, and a principal source of dollar income in some of these countries, and such revenue is necessary to help meet their balance of payments. Assisting these countries to improve their economic position is one of the major items in the United States economic foreign policy.

"At the 16th meeting of the Caribbean Commission, held in Surinam in May 1953, a resolution was adopted as follows:

"The Commission, having regard to the earnest desire of the peoples of the countries served by it to stimulate the inflow of visitors from the North American Continent into the Caribbean area and the fact that the 15-percent excise tax on travel does not apply to all countries in the surrounding area, with the result that the tax has a discriminatory effect upon the countries served by the Commission, strongly urges that each national section take steps, through diplomatic channels, to make representations requesting the United States Government to give immediate consideration to abolishing the tax on travel to this area."

"The Department has received notes from the embassies of all of the countries affected by the tax expressing the hope of their governments that the United States would amend its revenue laws to eliminate the 15-percent tax on transportation to their countries which is working to their economic detriment by impeding the flow of tourist dollars.

"The Department respectfully suggests that your committee give careful consideration to the passage of this legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code, which affects adversely and in a very direct manner the economic well-being of friendly neighboring countries.

"The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee, and that it concurs in recommending enactment of this legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"THURSTON B. MORTON,

"Assistant Secretary

"(For the Secretary of State)."

Similarly the Department of Commerce in a letter dated July 22, 1954, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated as follows:

"This letter is in reply to your request of April 5, 1954, for the views of this Department with respect to S. 1353, a bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from

Central America, and to and from the West Indies.

"In 1948 the 15-percent tax in effect on all foreign travel by United States citizens since 1945 was repealed, except for travel to and from the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere. By act of Congress, April 1, 1954, this tax was reduced to 10 percent. Thus the existing discrimination against travel to the Caribbean and Central America remains in effect, although modified, while travel to other Latin American destinations and Europe is untaxed.

"Section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code was adopted as a wartime measure to discourage travel. Not only has this necessity passed, but President Eisenhower in his economic-policy message to the Congress on March 30, 1954, pointed out the importance of an increased flow of United States travel to the national economy, and international trade. Repeal of the tax as envisaged by S. 1353 would stimulate travel to an area which relies in large part upon tourist income for its dollar revenue.

"Since the Caribbean in particular imports heavily, it presents a large nearby market for American exports. An increased flow of American dollars spent by American tourists would increase the area's ability to pay for American goods with resulting net benefits to our national economy.

"The Department accordingly recommends enactment of S. 1353.

"We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that they would interpose no objection to the submission of this letter to your committee and, further, that they concur in recommending enactment of the legislation.

"Sincerely yours,

"SINCLAIR WEEKS,

"Secretary of Commerce."

It is apparent, therefore, that the purpose of this legislation has the full support, not only of the countries affected, but also of the President and the interested executive departments of the Government.

The attitude of our Government was well expressed in the official instructions issued to the United States delegation which attended the Pan American Economic Conference recently held in Rio de Janeiro. The instructions stressed the necessity of promoting international travel in tourism to these areas, and pointed out that such development necessitated the elimination of the travel tax since it is considered to be one of the chief impediments to travel in these areas. Our Latin American neighbors have bitterly and justly criticized the tax as discriminatory, and have advocated its repeal as one of the means which should be employed to assist them in establishing a sound economy to our mutual advantage.

At the recent Inter-American Economic Conference, held in Rio de Janeiro, which I attended as a delegate, our Latin American friends pointed out very strongly their opposition to this extremely unfair tax and its effect upon their economies. At that conference the United States delegation strongly endorsed the principle of increasing the trade among the Americas and the removal of various restrictions on travel and commerce. In addition we indicated to our Latin American friends that we would do everything possible to consider the repeal of this tax.

Removal of this tax will contribute greatly towards strengthening the economies of our Latin American neighbors by increasing the flow of tourist dollars to these areas. In so doing, we will make a substantial contribution toward better hemispheric defense, and at the same time strike a devastating blow against the international Communist conspiracy.

There has been no testimony in connection with similar legislation introduced by

me in the past session of the Congress from any governmental agency, private individual or geographical area that the imposition of the present transportation tax to these areas is good, fair, or beneficial. Attempts to justify it are based solely on the argument that it produces some revenue. However, the amendment which I propose would have an insignificant effect on the total proceeds of the transportation tax, for it is estimated that the loss in tax would be approximately \$10 million which is indeed a very small sum in comparison to the beneficial effects which its repeal would have in cementing better relationships with our Latin American neighbors as well as our good neighbor to the north, Canada.

In addition it seems obvious to me that by increasing travel to these areas, tax revenues from the domestic portion of this travel would be increased sufficiently to equal or exceed the estimated revenue loss.

I am sure that the Members of the Senate recognize that there is much that needs to be done to help Latin America and while my bill does not provide an entire solution to the many problems we must face, it is very definitely a step in the right direction.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I am going to recommend that the bill be given early consideration, as well as to urge my colleagues to give their support to the bill in committee, and on the floor of the Senate, for in so doing they will actively demonstrate to our Latin American friends that the words "good neighbor" are more than just mere platitudes.

UNITY OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), 3d session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary.

TESTIMONY OF FORMER RUSSIAN CODE CLERK RELATING TO THE INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on January 4, 1954, representatives of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary journeyed to Canada to question Igor Gouzenko, former code clerk in the Soviet Embassy at Ottawa, under a cooperative agreement worked out between the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the United States Department of State.

A transcript of the testimony of Mr. Gouzenko subsequently was released

by the Canadian Government, pursuant to the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee, transmitted through the Department of State.

Unfortunately, this transcript was made available only in mimeographed form, and only a very few copies, relatively speaking, were distributed. The Internal Security Subcommittee has received requests for copies of this testimony, but has been unable to supply them. We are informed that Canadian officials have no copies available for distribution.

Because this questioning of Igor Gouzenko was in a very real sense a part of the activities of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, and the transcript of testimony should be formally and permanently recorded, I propose to ask that this testimony may be printed as a Senate document.

Before I make that request formally, let me say that the Gouzenko testimony is both valuable and informative. While a substantial part of Gouzenko's story already had been told, the questioning by members and counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee did bring out some facts not previously known, and the testimony did furnish some leads which were useful to the committee. Furthermore, in view of the public statements Mr. Gouzenko had made that he had information of value which he desired to give to the Internal Security Subcommittee, that committee would have been remiss in its duty if it had not sought and taken advantage of the earliest opportunity to question Mr. Gouzenko.

In view of the entire situation as outlined, this testimony by Mr. Gouzenko should be preserved as an official paper of the United States Senate; and I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the transcript of the testimony of Igor Gouzenko, given on January 4, 1954, under questioning by members and the counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate, may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sunday nominations have been received from the President and have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Without objection, the nominations will be printed in the RECORD; and pursuant to a rule adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations in the 83d Congress, the nominations will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

(For nominations referred to, see end of Senate proceedings of today.)

BETTER USE OF SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER — THE FORTHCOMING CHICAGO CONFERENCE AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement prepared by me, with attachments, on the subject of accelerating United States scientific progress in both civilian and military fields.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the attachments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have long been deeply interested in the effective utilization of the Nation's scientific manpower.

I regard this as a twofold necessity: (a) for the very survival of our Nation in this atomic-hydrogen-jet age; (b) for the prosperity of our expanding economy.

It is clear from great many evidences that the gap of superiority between American science and technology over that of the U. S. R. is being increasingly narrowed. Why? Because of the all-out Soviet effort to broaden Russia's industrial-military-scientific base.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS

I commented on this phase in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 16, 1954, on page A6844 when I reproduced a grim analysis of Soviet engineering progress by M. H. Trytten, Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Research Council.

I also commented on November 10 on page 15913 with regard to the important work of the National Inventors Council of the United States Department of Commerce.

Earlier, on August 6, in the RECORD on pages 13505 and 13506, I had cited the need for improved military utilization of our scientists. In my judgment, it is folly to concentrate exclusively on training our manpower on today's weapons, when some of the most skilled young and older brains could be at work preparing tomorrow's weapon systems.

CHICAGO SYMPOSIUM, FEBRUARY 10 AND 11

I am pleased, therefore, that on February 10, there is being held a symposium by the Society of American Military Engineers, and cosponsored by a great many other fine public and private groups. At this meeting, there will be considered more effective military utilization of the Nation's scientific resources.

I have in my hand the text of the announcement, listing the numerous scientific, business, and military leaders who will participate in the important conference.

I congratulate these men on their forthcoming patriotic contributions to this important discussion.

While, unfortunately, it now appears that it will not be possible for me personally to be on hand, I want to say that I regard this conference as one of the most significant such gatherings which has been held in the post-war era.

The subject matter affects American education; it affects selective service and reserve policy; it affects American business and labor and agriculture.

The United States has around 300,000 scientists and 500,000 engineers. Our engineer shortage alone is around 90,000. Every major newspaper in the United States, particularly on Sundays, is full of advertisements urgently soliciting engineers to apply to fill critical job vacancies, particularly in defense plants.

I AM INTERESTED FROM TWO STANDPOINTS

Now, I want to say that wholly aside from our military effort, as crucial as that is, it is essential that America greatly increase her research effort in both pure and applied research in order to serve the expanding needs of our Nation.

I am especially interested in this subject, from the standpoint of both the committees on which I am privileged to serve. Thus, from my position on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have always sought to emphasize the need for greater scientific cooperation—civilian and military—between the Allied Nations.

I am convinced that we have not begun adequately to tap either the scientific genius of our own citizens, nor that of the great western bloc of nations. According to information compiled at my direction by counsel for our committee, this lag in interrelated scientific coordination is a particularly important problem in our western defense-economic effort.

Secondly, it is my privilege to serve as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trade-Mark, and Copyright Law. From that position, I have sought to encourage inventions as such, as a part of our overall technological progress.

LETTER FROM NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

In performing my role, I have been in constant touch with numerous heads of agencies of our Government, including Dr. Arthur Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Along a similar line, I have also been in contact with the distinguished Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Alan T. Waterman.

Dr. Waterman promptly and thoroughly responded to a recent inquiry as to the past, present, and future work of his distinguished Foundation.

He reported, among other things, I am pleased to say, that my own State of Wisconsin has contributed significantly to the Foundation's work. Thus, 32 research grants have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within my State.

I append the text of the announcement of the Chicago symposium, along with the text of the reply by Dr. Waterman to my most recent inquiry.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

(Thursday and Friday, February 10 and 11, 1955, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.)

SPONSORS

The Society of American Military Engineers.

Industry

The National Industrial Conference Board. Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

National Association of Manufacturers. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc. Illinois Manufacturers Association. Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Government

United States Department of Defense. Corps of Engineers, United States Army. Bureau of Yards and Docks, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy. United States Air Force (Installations). Industrial College of the Armed Forces. United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. Arctic Institute of North America. United States Department of Labor.

Professional societies

Scientific Manpower Commission. Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Constituent Societies of Engineers Joint Council

American Society of Civil Engineers. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

American Institute of Electrical Engineers. American Society for Engineering Education.

The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.

American Institute of Chemical Engineers. American Waterworks Association.

National Science Teachers Association.

Western Society of Engineers.

Armed Forces Chemical Association, Midwest chapter.

Engineers Society of Milwaukee.

WHY THIS CONFERENCE

The number of engineers and scientists graduating from our technical schools is considerably less than that needed to meet the demand. American industry, school faculties and the Armed Forces are increasingly feeling the shortage of technically trained manpower which could well be the deciding factor in another national emergency. Well qualified committees and commissions are studying this entire situation, and their reports are receiving more and more attention from news media.

With the expiration of the Selective Service law in June 1955, another bill dealing with military manpower will be introduced in the Congress. This bill will have far-reaching effects on the future welfare of this country. Certainly, it will require exhaustive reconsideration of our entire manpower policy by the Congress.

The Society of American Military Engineers with the cooperation of those in the technical branches of the Armed Forces, American industry, technical education, and engineering and scientific societies will bring together high ranking representation from all of these groups and organizations at this conference in Chicago on February 10-11, 1955.

This conference has received the attention of a number of experienced educators and military and industrial men. It is their united opinion that people occupying positions of responsibility in our legislative, military, educational, and industrial life could well come together to direct their thinking to the utilization of our especially trained manpower and skilled craftsmen in ways which will best serve the Nation.

OBJECTIVES

There is great public interest in our comparative world position in technological matters, as well as in all matters concerning military service. This interest, plus the varied viewpoints and responsible positions of those in attendance at this conference, should result in the conference serving as an unusual source of reliable public information. In addition, specific recommendations coming from this conference should receive most careful consideration of all those concerned with any phase of manpower utilization.

LENOX R. LOHR,

President.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

Thursday, February 10

8:30-10:30 a. m.: Registration, mezzanine floor.

10:30-12 noon: Opening session, grand ballroom.

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Monsignor George J. Casey, Vicar General, Archdiocese of Chicago.

Chairman: Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Speaker: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co., What It Takes To Get Production (a visual presentation of the specific contributions made by technical people in typical mass production industries).

12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States Army (retired) chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Speaker: Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council—"Our Technical Manpower Situation Today."

2 p. m.: Afternoon session. The development and Utilization of Our Technical Manpower.

Chairman: Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Speakers: Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), The Needs of Industry.

Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology, Technical Education and Technical Societies.

Brig. Gen. Carlton Dargusch, Military Service Legislation.

Discussion: Dr. Walter H. Zinn, director, Argonne National Laboratory; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, Director of Selective Service; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dean D. H. Loughridge, Technological Institute, Northwestern University.

Friday, February 11

9:30 a. m.-12 noon: Panel symposium.

NOTE.—The entire time of this session will be devoted to the various panel members replying to questions on the general subject of the conference. These questions will be those submitted in advance or during the conference.

Chairman and moderator: Ralph L. Goetzberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.

Panel members: Dr. John T. Rettaliata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology; Carter Lane Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel; United States Senator Alexander Wiley (tentative); Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council; Leo R. Werts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manpower, United States Department of Labor; Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Institute of Technology; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana); Dr. J. Roscoe Miller, president, Northwestern University; Dean A. A. Potter, Purdue University; M. H. Isenberg, president, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, United States Air Force, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations; L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; M. M. Boring, engineering manpower consultant, General Electric Co.; Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, development engineering division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Edwin L. Yates, central office personnel activities, General Motors Corp.; Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission; W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council; Dean W. L. Everitt, chairman, administrative division, American Society for Engineering Education; Thomas R. Reid, chairman, subcommittee on manpower, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director, office of civic affairs, Ford Motor Co.; Dr. Edmond Claxton, director of research, Armstrong Cork Co., and chairman, subcommittee on manpower and research, National Association of Manufacturers.

(Panel discussions will continue from 2 p. m. to 4:30 p. m.)
12 noon: Luncheon.

Chairman: United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (tentative).

Speaker: Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Defense Mobilization Program—With Emphasis on Manpower Aspects.

Panel consultants: M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission; Dr. Joseph O. Hirschfelder, University of Wisconsin; Hon. Dewey Short, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; Hon. Overton Brooks, House of Representatives, Armed Services Committee; H. H. Armsby, Chief for Engineering Education, Department of Health, Engineering, and Welfare, United States Office of Education; Theron H. Rice, secretary, national defense committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Rear Adm. R. F. A. Studts, Director, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Representatives of the American Legion: Seaborn P. Collins, national commander; Bruce P. Henderson, chairman, national security council; James P. Ringley.

COMMITTEES

General chairman: Lenox R. Lohr, president, the Society of American Military Engineers and president, Museum of Science and Industry.

Program committee

Chairman: L. J. Fletcher, vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Dr. Thomas H. Chilton, technical director, Development Engineering Division, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

W. T. Cavanaugh, executive secretary, Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.

Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, director, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

M. T. Carpenter, president, Scientific Manpower Commission.

Ralph L. Goetzenberger, vice president, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regular Co.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Dan A. Sullivan, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Publicity committee

Chairman: John F. O'Keefe, secretary, Chicago Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical & Engineering News.

J. Earl Harrington, executive secretary, Western Society of Engineers.

D. M. MacMaster, director, Museum of Science & Industry.

Stewart Howe, vice president in charge of Development & Public Relations, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Finance committee

Chairman: Dan A. Sullivan, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, Society of American Military Engineers.

Arrangements committee

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., Inc.

Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

Willis Gale, chairman, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Lt. Gen. Hobart R. Gay, United States Army, commanding, Fifth Army.

Maj. Gen. Carl R. Gray, former commanding officer, Transportation Corps, United States Army.

Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, United States Navy, Commandant, Ninth Naval District.

Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

W. A. Roberts, president, Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.

Merrill C. Meigs, vice president, the Hearst Corp.

William V. Kahler, president, Illinois Bell Telephone Co.

Lt. Gen. C. C. Haffner, Jr., chairman of the board, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.

James L. Donnelly, executive vice president, Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.

H. A. Barber, president, Barber-Greene Co.

Dr. John T. Rettallata, president, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president, Remington Rand, Inc.

Dr. Leverett Lyon, chairman, executive committee, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

John S. Knight, publisher, Chicago Daily News.

H. S. Eberhard, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

James F. Oates, Jr., chairman, the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co.

John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.

Walter J. Cummings, chairman, Continental, Ill., National Bank and Trust Co.

Ross D. Siragusa, president, Admiral Corp.

Marshall Field, Jr., editor and publisher, Chicago Sun-Times.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, CEC, United States Navy, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks.

J. Lewis Powell, Office, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics.

Lt. Gen. W. B. Kean, executive director, Chicago Housing Authority.

Carlton S. Proctor, Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge.

Charles W. Bryan, Jr., president, Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co.

Dr. Louis C. McCabe, Chief, Fuels and Explosives Division, Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior.

Maj. Gen. Douglas L. Weart, national director, the Society of American Military Engineers.

Walter J. Murphy, editor, Chemical and Engineering News.

Col. Henry Crown, Chairman, Material Service Corporation.

Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, Assistant Chief of Staff, Installations, United States Air Force.

Gail A. Hathaway, Engineering Manpower Commission.

Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive officer, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

Brig. Gen. L. H. Whiting, president, American Furniture Mart.

A. M. Thompson, chairman, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co.

A. T. Etcheson, executive vice president, Illinois Bankers Association.

Dr. Gustav Egloff, director of research, Universal Oil Products Co.

F. M. Rich, general superintendent, Indiana Harbor Works, Inland Steel Co.

E. J. Albrecht, E. J. Albrecht Co.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It was very heartening, indeed, to receive your letter of December 27, 1954, which showed such understanding of the problems confronting us in the National Science Foundation. It is now commonly accepted that our national security and welfare depend in no small degree upon the strengthening of our scientific effort.

The problem is primarily one of finding ways and means to insure a satisfactory level of basic scientific research and to have sufficient fully trained, highly qualified, scientists in the country. As Dr. James B. Conant stated in the first annual report of the Foundation: "In the advance of science and its application to many practical problems, there is no substitute for first-class men. Ten second-rate scientists or engineers cannot do the work of one who is in the first rank." The administration's present concern with this problem is shown by the fact that a special Interdepartmental Committee on the Training of Scientists and Engineers, of which I was a member, has considered the problem and recently made a report to the President.

The National Science Foundation has been attacking this problem on several fronts.

First of all, we have a program of grants for support of basic research, almost entirely in the universities. Besides supporting valuable basic research, this grants program provides opportunities to potential young scientists to participate as assistants to established researchers and thus increase their competence. We are recommending a substantial increase in this program for fiscal 1956.

Second, the Foundation since its inception has had a program of graduate fellowships which assists selected science students in continuing their training in science. These fellowships to date have been awarded for the most part to students who have achieved their bachelor's degree and are working toward their doctor's degree. As an indication of the demand for these predoctoral fellowships, we received last year applications from 2,865 students, 657 of whom were awarded fellowships. An additional 1,359 received honorable mention as being of fellowship caliber.

We believe that a Federal fellowship program, particularly at the predoctoral level, should be used primarily to stimulate interest and to assist the truly outstanding student. Therefore, while we are recommending to the Congress this year a small increase for predoctoral fellowships, we are recommending a relatively more substantial increase for our program of postdoctoral fellowships, and are also proposing that a special postdoctoral fellowship program be instituted for senior scientists.

Third, since the problem of increasing the quality and number of scientists must be attacked across a broad front, we have initiated a program called "education in the sciences." This program recognizes that a widening gap between the demand for and supply of teachers of science in the years ahead is possibly the greatest obstacle to the training of adequate numbers of high-caliber scientists. If we are to meet the requirements of an ever-expanding economy and the military demands created by international tension, we must make certain that our high schools and colleges are adequately staffed with well qualified and stimulating science teachers. To cope with these problems the Foundation has under way a 3-point program relating to help for teachers, improvement of the science curriculum and motivation of students. We are recommending a substantial expansion in this program for the 1956 fiscal year.

However, the problems are intricate and are not susceptible of easy solution. We believe that many more facts need to be known and analyzed before wise decisions as to Federal policies to achieve the desired results can be made. To this end, the foundation now has a comprehensive program of studies underway. These studies include:

(a) Comprehensive survey of the present and future supply and use of scientific and technical manpower in the United States, with special reference to Government, industry and educational institutions.

(b) A technical study of methods of measuring demand-supply relationships with respect to scientific manpower.

(c) Studies of doctor of philosophy degrees granted in science and a study of various methods of increasing the competence and effectiveness of our teachers of science.

(d) A study of factors influencing our most talented high-school graduates in deciding whether or not to continue formal education.

(e) Study of feasibility and desirability of scholarship aid to college students.

These studies will be extended in the future. The information assembled will be helpful in determining the effectiveness of present Federal policies and in isolating particular problem areas to which new solutions must be found. Among the major problems which must be examined will be those relating to the need for undergraduate scholarship aid and for assistance to States and educational institutions in support of the teaching of science. As conclusions are arrived at, we will make appropriate recommendations.

We feel, therefore, that the budget proposed to the Congress for the foundation for fiscal 1956 represents an appropriate step forward. In reply to your kind offer of cooperation we must state that while it would be possible administratively to enlarge any of our programs beyond the amounts recommended to Congress, we are not prepared to recommend such action at this time. If Congress approves our budget as submitted, we will be able to expand our programs somewhat and to conduct the studies necessary to determine whether more ambitious Federal programs should be undertaken in the future.

You will be interested to know, I believe, that to date 32 research grants totaling \$421,920 have been awarded to educational institutions or organizations within the State of Wisconsin. In addition, the foundation has awarded six grants to scientists in the State of Wisconsin to assist them in travel to international scientific meetings. Since the foundation fellowship program was established, there have been 54 recipients of fellowships who were residents of Wisconsin. In addition, 56 have received honorable mention in fellowship competition. It may be of particular interest to you to know that 86 recipients of foundation fellowships have elected to pursue their studies at the University of Wisconsin. Finally, in addition to Dr. Edwin B. Fred, who is a member of the National Science Board, there are 14 residents of the State of Wisconsin who are serving or have served on the foundation's science advisory panels.

I have tried to give you our general approach and plans in reply to your kind letter. We will take the liberty, if we may, of keeping you advised as to our progress and plans from time to time. If you would care to go into the matter further, I should of course be pleased to visit you at your convenience. I particularly appreciate your interest and will welcome your views at any time.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Future of American Foreign Policy," delivered by him at Philadelphia, Pa., on January 10, 1955.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement containing biographical sketch and description of career of Dr. Abraham Shaoni, grand master of Masons of the State of Israel.

MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If there is no further routine business to be transacted, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk the recommendations of the majority for the consideration of the Senate with reference to the respective chairmen and the majority membership of the standing committees of the Senate. I understand that the distinguished minority leader is prepared to submit recommendations from the minority conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, by direction of the Republican conference, I submit a list of Republican appointments to the standing committees of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the respective lists of the majority and minority conferences.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; John J. Williams, of Delaware; and Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas.

On Appropriations: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; and Charles E. Potter, of Michigan.

On Armed Services: Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, chairman; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; John Stennis, of Mississippi; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Francis Case, of South Dakota; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; and Herman Welker, of Idaho.

On Banking and Currency: J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, chairman; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Frederick G. Payne, of Maine; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On District of Columbia: Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia, chairman; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland; Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska; Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; Gordon Allott, of Colorado; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Finance: Harry Floyd Byrd, of Virginia, chairman; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; J. Allen Frear, of Delaware; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Aiben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; and Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah.

On Foreign Relations: Walter F. George, of Georgia, chairman; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; John Sparkman, of Alabama; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Aiben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; William Langer, of North Dakota; William F. Knowland, of California; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; and Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

On Government Operations: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: James E. Murray, of Montana, chairman; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; and Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; George A. Smathers, of Florida; Price Daniel, of Texas; Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; John Marshall Butler, of Maryland; Charles E. Potter, of Michigan; James H. Duff, of Pennsylvania; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; and Frederick G. Payne, of Maine.

On the Judiciary: Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, chairman; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Price Daniel, of Texas; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William Langer, of

North Dakota; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Herman Welker, of Idaho; and John Marshall Butler, of Maryland.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Lister Hill, of Alabama, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Herbert H. Lehman, of New York; John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Irving M. Ives, of New York; William A. Purtell, of Connecticut; Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; George H. Bender, of Ohio; and Gordon Allott, of Colorado.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island; A. S. Mike Monroney, of Oklahoma; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Frank Carlson, of Kansas; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; William Langer, of North Dakota; Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska; Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa; and Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey.

On Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Stuart Symington, of Missouri; Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina; Pat McNamara, of Michigan; Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Francis Case, of South Dakota; Prescott Bush, of Connecticut; Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire; and Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska.

On Rules and Administration: Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Frank A. Barrett, of Wyoming; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; and Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the membership lists be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

FARM PRICE SUPPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as the 84th Congress begins its legislative work, I should like to speak for a few moments on a controversial matter which was the subject of great debate during the 83d Congress; and which, from all indications, is likely to become again the subject of congressional inquiry, although I hope not legislation. I refer to the field of farm price support legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in an address before the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives Convention at Chicago, Ill., made a statement, with respect to the flexible price support features of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which merits magnification at this time. Secretary Benson rightly concluded that, since all basic commodities, except wheat, will be supported at or near 90 percent of parity in 1955, "if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necessary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program." In addition, the Secretary discussed the methods and

programs being used to attack this problem of shrinking farm profits.

Since farm-price-support policy is a complex subject, I most sincerely commend this talk to the Members of the Senate for their reading, and to that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVES FACE THE FARM PRICE SQUEEZE
(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before 26th annual meeting of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Chicago, Ill.)

This represents another homecoming for me and, as always, it is an inspiring experience to visit again with so many good friends. Among my most treasured remembrances are the years when I served as executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

It is a great pleasure to be back with you today and to have this challenging opportunity to discuss our mutual interest in developing a prosperous, stable and free agriculture. The theme of this 26th annual meeting—"Farmer Cooperatives Attack the Price-Cost Squeeze"—is an appropriate one. It ties together the immediate problem facing farmers and an effective method of meeting it.

For nearly 4 years now, farm prices have been declining. Since February of 1951, prices received by farmers have plunged 24 percent, while the prices they pay have fallen only 4 percent. These figures constitute an eloquent explanation of why farm pocket-books are being pinched.

The financial pangs which go with readjustment to a peacetime economy are not new to agriculture. We have suffered them following every war in our history. Just as farm commodity prices go up farther than the general price level under the stimulus of war and inflation, they also drop farther and faster than most nonfarm prices while the economy is readjusting to more nearly normal conditions. We are making the transition this time with fewer and less severe dislocations in agriculture and other segments of our economy than ever before.

The depression which was so freely predicted a year ago failed to materialize. From an economic point of view, 1954 proved to be the best peacetime year in history, although agriculture did not fully share in this prosperity. The changeover has hurt and is hurting most of our farm people. I would not minimize the seriousness of the situation.

Yet I believe all of the evidence indicates we have seen the worst. I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

For several months now, most farm prices have been relatively stable. For the last 2 years, in fact, the parity ratio has averaged about 90, fluctuating narrowly between 94 and 86. It will be recalled that there was a 19-point plunge in the parity ratio during the 2 years preceding January 1953 when the new administration was installed.

We must not be content with mere stability of farm prices at current levels, however. But the price decline had to be halted before it could be reversed. The first half of that objective is being attained. The job at hand now is to get farm prices back into better balance with the general price level.

While we are doing this, we must never lose sight of the fact that price alone does not insure farm prosperity. It is price times volume that makes gross income. The story does not end even there. It's what remains in a farmer's pocket after the bills are paid—

his net income—that measures whether he has had a good year or a bad one. The theme you have chosen for this meeting shows that you clearly recognize the importance of these other factors besides price.

There are four obvious fronts on which we can attack this problem of shrinking farm profits. We are moving forward on all of them.

First, Government price-support programs help farmers market many of their products in a more orderly manner, minimizing the severity of seasonal gluts and surpluses. Nonrecourse storage loans on a variety of crops provide guaranteed minimum prices to qualified farmers. Authority to set aside up to \$2½ billion worth of surplus commodities has helped to take some of the pressure off free market prices of wheat and cotton.

Second, we are expanding our markets abroad through the billion dollar Agricultural Trade Development Act which permits the sale of surplus farm products for foreign currencies and provides additional outlets through donations for relief and famine aid. We are moving increased quantities of Government-owned surpluses into channels of consumption at home through school lunch programs and gifts to needy persons, institutions, and welfare agencies. In addition to stepped-up consumption of dairy products by the Armed Forces, we are expanding our school lunch milk program by \$50 million a year.

These actions tend to reduce the supply and strengthen demand for farm products. Their cumulative effect upon agricultural prices should become even more apparent in the year ahead.

The third line of attack upon the farm cost-price squeeze is through research, education, and improved marketing. Government outlays for these programs have been increased by approximately \$20 million during the current fiscal year. The great gains of agriculture in the past have come about largely through this approach and so, I am confident, will those of the future.

Greater efficiency, broader use of the better feeds, seeds, and breeds, the adoption of improved cultural practices and employment of sound marketing methods—all taken together—will do more to help farmers meet the cost-price squeeze than any program of Government aid which could be devised by mortal man.

Fourth, farmers themselves, through their cooperative efforts, are attacking—and effectively attacking—this perplexing cost-price problem. I am certain that your discussions here will give further impetus to that drive. I mention this phase of the over-all campaign last—not because I think it is least important but because I should like to discuss it more fully at this point.

During the lifetime of most of us gathered here, the American cooperative movement has progressed from a small, struggling upstart to a vast, thriving enterprise. Cooperatives formed by a handful of men two or three decades ago have mushroomed into flourishing organizations, serving many thousands of farmer members.

Cooperatives operate in many fields today, with varying success. I believe that a major reason for their growth and their greatest opportunity to be of further service to agriculture is found in two main areas: the marketing of farm commodities and the cooperative purchasing of the fertilizers, seeds, feeds, and other products which farmers require in their operations. In carrying out these principal functions, farmer cooperatives are hitting the cost-price squeeze from two directions. Cooperative marketing can bring better prices, while cooperative buying often reduces costs.

In an age which places so much emphasis upon size and the dramatic, our sense of values may sometimes become confused.

When we buy a new automobile, it is likely to be horsepower, rather than safety features, which guides our choice. The home-run hitter, who strikes out oftener than he connects, wins the popular applause while the solid team player often goes almost unnoticed. The corporation executive who has guided his firm through a year of record-breaking profits makes the front pages while an important scientific advance may rate a line or two back near the classified ads.

It is understandable enough that we should measure the success of some of our farmer cooperatives by similar standards—by their financial statements, by their volume of business, or even by their total membership. Yet all of us know that the real test is a very simple one: Has this cooperative contributed to a better standard of living for its individual farmer members? Has it increased their income? Has it brought real benefits and services which would not have been theirs except for this cooperative?

If the answer to these questions is "Yes," then we have a farmer cooperative in the true sense of the term.

All of us who are interested in the continuing success of the cooperative movement—members and officials alike—must never lose sight of the real objective. Farmer cooperatives must not adopt abuses once practiced by some commercial enterprises—the very abuses which, in many instances, originally led to the formation of these same cooperatives.

Recently I issued a memorandum relating to the responsibilities and activities of employees of the Department. One section is of particular interest to cooperatives. It provides that no employee of the Department of Agriculture shall approve contracts with any cooperative or other commercial organization which deducts, or checks off from payments owed to farmers, membership dues in any general or specialized farm organization, except with the consent of the individual farmer.

The reason for this order is obvious. It is not the function of the Department of Agriculture to recruit farmers, directly or indirectly, as involuntary members of any organization. I am pleased to report that most cooperatives and farm organizations are apparently in agreement with this philosophy.

As we move into this new year, the Agricultural Act of 1954, with its flexible price supports for basic commodities, will get its first test. It marks a change of direction, rather than any revolutionary upheaval. Adjustments in the level of support will be gradual, in line with President Eisenhower's recommendations.

Tobacco will continue to be supported at 90 percent of parity, and it seems probable that will also be the level for peanuts and cotton in 1955. Current estimates are that corn will be supported at 88 percent of parity. Rice may be supported at about the same level as last year if marketing quotas are approved. Only in the case of wheat will price supports be at the minimum of 82½ percent.

These figures strongly indicate that if farm income from some of the basic crops is lower this year than last, it will not be because of flexible price supports. The reduction will come, if it comes at all, from the curtailment of acreage and production made necessary by surpluses accumulated under the earlier program.

In the case of such feed grains as oats, barley, grain sorghums, and rye—which have been under a system of discretionary flexible price supports for many years—the level for 1955 will be at 70 percent of parity. This represents a reduction from the 85 percent supports prevailing during the last year.

It is apparent that large acreages diverted from wheat, corn, and cotton will go into feed grains—more even than in 1954, which saw a sizeable shift in this direction. Con-

tinued supports at 85 percent of parity could only mean the Government would wind up as the owner of a considerable portion of the increased feed grain production.

At the same time, the serious and protracted drought which still grips more than 900 counties in 18 States has created severe local feed shortages. Drought-hit farmers must be given every opportunity to produce as much feed as possible when rains do come. If drought continues, lower price supports will make feed grains available to farmers at less cost than if the Government were bidding a higher price. This will encourage the movement of these grains into channels of consumption, rather than into storage.

I am convinced that our new program of flexible price supports for the basic commodities will work toward better balanced production in the years ahead. And I should like to see this balance restored primarily through an increase in consumption both here and abroad, rather than through continued strict production controls. Flexible supports will help restore the function of price in our marketing system.

We can best insure a continuation of our great progress as a Nation by maintaining a free and fluid economy. Government policy must not be permitted to freeze our agricultural production in uneconomic patterns. Neither should we freeze people in farming or in any other occupation. It is the basic freedom of the individual to shift to new pursuits with the changing times that has helped to make us the most productive country on earth.

All Americans share in the benefits which spring from a free society. The rapid advances brought about through the application of agricultural research and education and improved marketing methods have permitted millions of people to leave the land in recent decades for other productive enterprises in the cities and towns. They are making the automobiles, the radios, the television sets, and a variety of other goods which add to our better living standards. The remarkable efficiency of agriculture has made possible this important contribution to our entire economy.

Select, if you will, any Nation on the face of this globe where one-half or even one-fourth of the total labor force is producing food and fiber to meet domestic needs and you will also find a country barren of most luxury goods and even many of the things we regard as necessities. I have little sympathy for the anguished cries of those who insist that America will be ruined unless Government somehow makes farming so attractive that no rural lad will ever again venture forth to the city. As a Nation, we would never have come this far under such a philosophy. Under it, we wouldn't get where we are going, either.

Who shall say what the future limitations may be upon our national development? In agriculture, what new crops will tomorrow bring? What new uses for old crops? In a world just now entering the atomic age, some of the most exciting laboratories ever known to man may be right on our farms.

Back in 1924 American farmers harvested just under 5 million bushels of soybeans. In 1954 our soybean production was a record-breaking 343 million bushels, with a market value of nearly \$1 billion. Thus in the short space of three decades we have seen the development of a new major crop in this country and with it a new major industry.

We may be approaching the day when it won't be possible to coax that one additional egg from our top laying hens. Sometime the top-producing cow on one of our experimental farms will perhaps cock a disapproving eye at a scientist and say, "Look, this has gone far enough—you've got the last pint."

But future generations need fear no shortages of food or fiber if we succeed in bring-

ing the average output of our farms up somewhere near the productive levels of our more efficient units. This, we know, can be done.

For the year ahead the outlook is generally good for agriculture and the Nation as a whole. Business activity is at the highest peacetime level in history. In total we are consuming more food than ever before and our tastes are running more and more to the higher priced protein diet items. This trend seems likely to continue and it emphasizes that the needs of tomorrow will be for more feed and forage to provide the livestock products which our population is demanding.

As I indicated earlier, the new Trade Development Act is helping us expand our foreign markets. To date we have concluded or are in the process of negotiating sales for foreign currency involving \$453 million worth of surplus farm commodities owned by Commodity Credit Corporation. Wheat and cotton are the principal items involved, although tobacco, rice, barley, and other commodities will also be included.

There is another comparatively recent development that holds tremendous promise for agriculture. Thanks to President Eisenhower's personal and official concern and the action of the 83d Congress, the Department of Agriculture for the first time has the tools to deal effectively with the problems of small watersheds. We are now prepared to help technically and, to a limited extent, financially, in carrying out projects which the individual cannot complete on his own.

We may now bring the water element into balance with the soil element in our national soil and water program. We have new authorization for approaching soil and water problems on a watershed basis. This will accelerate and implement the soil and water program that has gained so much momentum over the past two decades. It offers new opportunities to work on problems that require community action.

No one can grow up on a southern Idaho farm, as I did, and be oblivious to the anxieties and heartaches surrounding the problems of water development and management. Still fresh in my memory are the disastrous floods that time and again wrought havoc with the canal systems and buried whole farms under sterile debris.

Nor am I unaware of the suffering and anguish which the last 4 years of continued drought have brought farmers and ranchers in the Southeast, parts of the Midwest and southern Great Plains.

These are reasons why I am firmly convinced that our water problem is welded to problems of land and people. Land and water are inseparable in planning and in use. It is the water which carries away so much of our soil. The water problem is not just one of shortages or floods affecting cities and industries. The problem has its beginning up on the farms and in the forests of our small watersheds.

In the Department of Agriculture we are determined to assist farmers to carry out a more effective program of soil and water development and wise utilization on a nationwide basis. This naturally includes protection and development of soil and water resources on individual farms and ranches and also in the small watersheds or sub-watersheds.

Everywhere farmers are interested in the efficient use of water. It is the lifeblood of the West, both for irrigated and dryland farming. And in the East, many farmers could use supplementary irrigation at some time during the growing season.

Farmer cooperatives have a vital stake in this whole problem which is tied so closely to the future welfare of agriculture. Currently there is broad interest in the new provision of the amended Water Facilities Act which authorizes direct or insured loans in all

States for soil and water conservation practices—for irrigation, drainage, pasture improvement and reforestation on farms. We may now insure such loans up to a total of \$25 million per year.

Farmers who participate in cooperative water developments may now borrow up to \$250,000 through the Farmers' Home Administration for a single joint project. The former limitation was \$100,000. Private lending agencies are matching the interest of farmers and groups of farmers in this expanded program. Private funds for FHA-insured loans for soil and water development and farm ownership are now available in an amount four times that of a year ago.

I have sought to emphasize in these remarks today several, though by no means all, of the programs which are being directed toward assuring a stable, prosperous and free agriculture. In many of them, farmers are playing the major role. Trade development, market expansion, research, education, conservation and progress through cooperative efforts are continuing, day-in-and-day-out operations. They are seldom dramatic. Consequently they do not always receive the attention they deserve, even though they are responsible for most of the great gains of agriculture.

The future of American agriculture is bright. A kind providence has blessed this Nation with vast natural resources—with soils and climate which with American ingenuity and courage have provided the basis for a standard of living unmatched in any other land. May God guide us in the wise use and conservation of these resources for the benefit of posterity and, indeed, for all mankind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators wish to speak, I desire to make a brief announcement concerning the business of the Senate.

At the conclusion of business today, I plan to move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next. On Friday consideration will be given to Senate Resolution 18, submitted by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and by a substantial majority of the other Members of this body. The subject of the resolution, the continuation of investigations of Communist conspiracy and subversion, was considered briefly on the floor during the recent interim session of the Senate. It may be that after the distinguished minority leader has counseled with Members on his side of the aisle, and perhaps with some of the Members on this side of the aisle, it will be desired to have the resolution referred to a committee.

However, if it be agreeable to the minority leader and the Members on his side of the aisle, and also agreeable to Members on this side of the aisle, I shall move on Friday to take the resolution from the table and ask for its consideration at that time.

I should like to place the Senate on notice that the text of the resolution has been printed in the RECORD and has been discussed on the floor of the Senate previously.

It may very well be that orderly procedure would indicate that the resolution should be referred to a committee; and if that be the feeling of any Member of the Senate, I believe that the distinguished minority leader would join

with me in moving that that course be followed. However, that procedure would not be necessary; and if all Senators were in agreement, the resolution might be considered on Friday.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal, vice M. Robert Guggenheim, resigned.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.
J. Robert Fluker, of Kansas.
Harold G. Kissick, of Maryland.
Leonard H. Price, of Virginia.
Louis F. Thompson, of Indiana.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James S. Beddie, of Maryland.
William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Maryland.
Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.
Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.
Charles F. Pick, Jr., of Virginia.
George M. Pollard, of Virginia.
Joseph Rosa, of Wisconsin.
Ansel N. Taylor, of Idaho.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of California.
Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.
Darwin J. DeGolia, of Maryland.
Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
John K. Havemeyer, of Illinois.
T. Greig Henderson, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Janke, of Ohio.
Miss Elizabeth Jorjick, of the District of Columbia.
Northrop H. Kirk, of California.
Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.
John B. Penfold, of Missouri.
Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.
Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
James A. Ramsay, of Massachusetts.
Robert L. Redding, of Florida.
Miss Genevieve F. Rifley, of Nebraska.
Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.

Horace L. Talley, of Virginia.
Niemann A. Terry, Jr., of South Carolina.
John C. Thornburg, of Maryland.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.

Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of Maine.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
James H. Ashida, of Washington.
Herbert Corkran, Jr., of Virginia.
Miss Mary G. Crain, of Maryland.
Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.
Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor Ebert, of Pennsylvania.
Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.
Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.
Miss Anna G. Foster, of Texas.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
Miss Charlotte M. Morehouse, of Virginia.
Peter J. Raineri, of New York.
Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
Richard J. Brynildsen, of California.
Miss Pamela F. Craig, of Pennsylvania.
Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
Donald B. Easom, of Wisconsin.
Louis P. Goetz III, of Pennsylvania.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Charles M. Coulter, Epworth Methodist Church, Toledo, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Father of all men and God of peace, we praise Thee for the innumerable blessings, both spiritual and material, which Thou hast bestowed upon us.

We thank Thee, Father, that Thou hast sent Thy witnesses in every period of our national life; that Thou hast raised up in our legislature noble men and women of clear vision, high ideals, unfaltering courage and with devotion to freedom, truth, and justice, who have enriched our individual and national life.

Our Father, we confess before Thee with sorrow and shame that too often we have tried to live without Thee. May we as a nation humble ourselves now under Thy mighty hand.

Most gracious God, we pray for these Representatives in Congress assembled. Thou knowest the difficult problems which confront them. Endow them with understanding, a pure purpose, and sound speech. Enable them to realize